

Minutes

SCIPIT Meeting #2

2007–2012 Stormwater Capital Improvement Program

Involvement Team

May 9, 2006

6:00 PM to 8:00 PM

BOCC Training Room

Sixth Floor, Clark County Public Services Building

Vancouver WA

Public SCIPIT Members in Attendance:

Tim Crawford, Dave Howard, Bill Owen, Virginia van Breemen, Ronald Wilson

Staff SCIPIT Members in Attendance:

Richard Drinkwater, Heath Henderson, Jeff Schnabel, Karen Streeter, Scott Wilson

SCIPIT Members Absent:

Robert Even, Donna Hale, Art Stubbs

Other Attendees:

Jerry Barnett, Jim Gladson, Trista Kobluskie, Tim Kraft, Earl Rowell, Fereidoon Safdari, Rod Swanson

Audience:

Ken Lader, Susan Rasmussen, Ron Wierenga

Administrative Items

Gladson welcomed the group to SCIPIT Meeting #2 and reviewed the Agenda. The Criteria Work Session will take an hour.

He reminded the group of the June 7th, 2006 Work Session with the Board of County Commissioners regarding stormwater planning. It will be held at 10:30 a.m. in the Public Service Center 6th Floor Training Room.

Review Minutes

Gladson asked for comments on the Minutes from the March 28, 2006 meeting. No comments were raised.

Review Meeting Handout

Barnett reviewed the contents of the meeting packet:

1. Agenda
2. PowerPoint Slide Presentation
3. Rough Project Evaluation Criteria
4. Criteria Discussion Points
5. Project Submittal Form
6. Updated Project List
7. Clark County Public Works Vision, Mission and Values
8. Chapter 4 from the Clark County Comprehensive Plan 2003-2023

Discuss Action Items from SCIPIT Meeting #1

Barnett responded to the list of action items from SCIPIT Meeting #1

Item	Response
1. consider the 20 acre split for development – all	Safdari and Swanson reviewed this, and it seems reasonable.
2. consider whether the two flooding-related criteria are separate, and how to word them	Has been addressed in updated criteria; see strikeout
3. consider whether projects that promote development goals are appropriate	Since funding will be separate, these criteria will stay
4. consider wording of the permit section	Wording updated; see criteria
5. consider relative point values and section maximums	Will be addressed during today's meeting
6. bring Clark County Public Works Mission and Goals	Provided in handout
7. bring Water Resources Mission Statements	Provided in handout

Howard asked for clarification on giving points to projects that meet new development goals. Barnett responded that projects that address new development goals can be included in the ranking process, but won't be funded with monies from the Clean Water Fee. The Board of County Commissioners asked for those projects be included.

SCIP Activities Since Meeting #1

Barnett reviewed the activities since March.

- The evaluation criteria have been modified
- Water Resources staff developed a list of issues, concerns and additions to the criteria, which is included in the handout as "Criteria Discussion Points"
- Swanson and other Water Resources staff refined the basin prioritization methodology
- Scheduled a Work Session with the BOCC on June 7th
- Barnett was interviewed on CVTV
- Stienbarger produced a brochure about the program

Criteria Work Session

Barnett asked the group to consider the updated criteria included in the handout as the basis for the discussion. The group began reviewing the fourth section, since the other sections were reviewed at the last meeting.

Protect and Improve Natural Watershed Functions

Henderson advocated consistency with other efforts, such as ESA, TMDLs, etc. Barnett noted that the idea is in the Criteria Discussion Points.

Howard asked if the criteria should be affected by LID or stream restoration work by other entities such as Clark PUD. Barnett stated that LID procedures rarely apply to the types of projects being reviewed. Howard suggested writing down reasons for including or excluding LID in order to be able to explain the reasoning to the public.

Barnett asked if "Includes low impact development practices" belongs in the section. Owen stated that he would like to see this kind of criteria. Barnett replied that it would be addressed in road standards and regulations. Owen stated that he does not have a problem eliminating it. Schnabel stated that LID is difficult to implement under current county code, so the criterion could be considered a placeholder. Drinkwater stated that there is no ultimate definition of "low impact." Drinkwater suggested removing the criterion; Barnett agreed.

Owen asked for the definition of "hydro-modifications." Streeter replied that it is anything that holds back water, a small dam, for instance.

Barnett stated that “Includes infiltration BMPs for existing development” is important because it matches County policy, which is to infiltrate whenever possible. Barnett recommended raising the point value; Safdari agreed. Barnett requested that the group look at point values after deciding on the wording of all criteria.

Owen asked if “Limits erosion of headwater streams” and “Reduces erosion on headwater streams caused by stormwater outfalls”, which appear under different subcategories, are too similar. Kraft replied that a particular project may meet more than one important objective, and so deserve a greater point value. Barnett indicated that any time a project gets the points for one, it would automatically get the points for the other, too, so why separate them? It would be more clear to combine the points of the redundant criteria into a single criterion.

Owen stated that other criteria are redundant, e.g. “Rehabilitates channel habitat” with “Improves channel habitat.”

Barnett asked the group if the redundancies should be removed. Henderson suggested removing the subcategories from each main section and uniting any redundant criteria, simplifying the list. The group agreed.

Owen asked a general question: most criteria focus on temperature and fine sediments. Are those supposed to be surrogates for other constituents that the county may be interested in? Barnett replied that most urbanized streams in Clark County have temperature problems. The fine sediments are a fisheries problem. Schnabel replied that temperature and fine sediments are surrogates to some degree; fine sediments frequently arrive with nutrients, bacteria, and metals.

Schnabel indicated that the change of wording of one criterion to “Removes pollutants of concern” from “Removes existing pollution sources” was designed to help address Henderson’s concern that projects fit in with other efforts such as ESA and TMDLs.

Criteria Discussion Points

The group discussed the Criteria Discussion Points from the handout.

Add a new bullet, “Located on private land with a willing landowners, worth 3 points

Barnett asked if the addition would be agreeable to the group. Howard asked why the point value is 3 when all other criteria in that category are 5. Schnabel responded that most point values in the Project Evaluation Criteria are placeholders at this point, but that the new criterion might be considered less valuable than the other in that section, thereby worth fewer points. Howard suggested using 5 as the placeholder until the point values are discussed.

Add two new items under the “INNOVATIVE FUNDING AND IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECTS” section:

- *Maintenance burden of existing problem*
- *Maintenance cost of proposed project*

Barnett asked Scott Wilson if Public Works Operations would be able to provide maintenance costs for current problems. Wilson indicated that he could in many instances. Streeter suggested that private landowners might demonstrate their own costs (i.e. paying people to cut down blackberries on their property every year, for instance). Gladson asked if the maintenance burden question is intended for County expenses only. Streeter indicated that if information is available from private landowners, the County might as well use it.

Scott Wilson asked how the costs translate into a point value for these criteria. Barnett replied that the costs would be considered high, medium, or low.

Howard asked how the project gets the points for these criteria. Barnett said that a project would meet the “Maintenance burden of existing problem” criteria if the existing problem had a *high* cost; a project would meet the “Maintenance cost of proposed project” criteria if the project had a *low* maintenance cost. Rowell clarified that the two are separate criteria.

Schnabel noted that it might be more difficult to find the maintenance burden of an existing problem at submittal time than the projected maintenance cost of the project. Henderson noted that roadway and stormwater facility projects could easily be projected; projects like stream restorations would be outside the responsibility of Operations

to maintain, therefore outside their ability to estimate maintenance costs. Wilson noted that many projects can be resolved without much maintenance burden.

Howard asked for examples of when a project would be included or omitted as a result of maintenance costs. Barnett replied that no project would be included or omitted based solely on these two criteria; it would simply gain points if either criteria were met. Swanson used a 100-cartridge filter vault system as an example of a high maintenance cost solution and a riparian restoration as a lower maintenance cost solution. The latter might meet the “low maintenance cost of proposed project” criteria while the former might not.

Barnett asked if the group should come back to the issue. Rowell advised the group to come back to the issue because the maintenance costs of storm facilities such as filter vault systems will be important to consider.

Some items under “PROTECT AND RESTORE NATURAL WATERSHED FUNCTIONS” are repeated, like “Limits erosion of headwater streams, rehabilitates channel habitat, and restores riparian forest.” And Review “PROTECT AND RESTORE NATURAL WATERSHED FUNCTIONS” section for ways to consolidate and reduce, possibly increasing point totals for some items.
Barnett noted that the group reviewed these previously.

New item under “Improve temperature-moderating processes” to address flow enhancement projects
Schnabel indicated that this issue disappears if the criteria subcategories will be removed.

Should the LID objective remain?
The group discussed this earlier.

Increase points for infiltration? It is specifically mentioned in the code/permits as the preferred method of stormwater management. And
Increase points for reconnecting floodplains? And
Increase points for reducing peak and duration? And
General discussion regarding point values in all categories
Barnett stated that the group would consider point values later.

New category for “SUPPORTS WATERSHED-SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES AND/OR REGIONAL PLANNING GOALS”

Schnabel stated that Water Resources staff is attempting to integrate stormwater basin planning with the SCIP process; the two processes are on different scales. Water Resources is doing stormwater basin planning in Whipple Creek right now; many projects on the list are from Whipple Creek. Water Resources will analyze each basin in the county systematically, and it will identify projects based on specific objectives for the watershed. The SCIP is looking at projects county-wide, regardless of basin planning status. Projects that meet a watershed-specific objective for a basin that has been analyzed should be favored with increased points because we will know that the a regional approach was used to identify the problem and solution. However, the increased point value should not completely overwhelm projects in basins that have not had stormwater basin planning done.

Two of the proposed criteria in this section are: “Supports one or more existing stormwater basin planning objectives for the watershed in which it is located” and “Supports one or more existing regional planning objectives for the watershed in which it is located (LCFRB salmon recovery plan, TIP plans, etc.” for 5 points each.

Barnett suggested moving the two criteria into the “PROTECT AND IMPROVE NATURAL WATERSHED FUNCTIONS” section. He stated that the TIP should not be included in the regional planning objective criteria because it is addressed in another criterion.

Owen stated that he agrees with the second criterion more than with the first because the objectives identified during stormwater basin planning theoretically should be “child” objectives to the “parent” objectives identified in a county-wide planning process like the SCIP. Basin objectives should simply be an application of the broader county-wide planning objectives for a particular watershed. Thus, there should be no conflict. It shouldn't make a

difference for the SCIP that the county happens to do that basin first. Projects that don't meet county-wide or project objectives should have been eliminated prior to the beginning of the SCIPIT process. A proposed project could be offered that meets general county-wide objectives but lies in a basin where thorough watershed planning/characterization has not occurred. With respect to the first proposed criteria (above), this project would be penalized simply because it is not located in one of these basins and would not receive these points.

Barnett responded that the stormwater basin planning process uncovers a lot of information, which should be used to help evaluate projects. Owen indicated that a large number of projects on the list already fall in the Whipple Creek basin, so most of the projects that are going to be recommended will be in Whipple Creek by default. Barnett replied that the funding is so low that few projects on the ultimately ranked list will be completed before the SCIPIT process begins again (next year, then every two years after), creating a replacement list of ranked projects each time. In other words, as each basin undergoes stormwater basin planning, projects that meet the specific objectives identified in the plan will then meet the criterion and be awarded additional points during the next SCIPIT process.

Gladson restated his understanding of the arguments presented as 1) taking one or more of the point totals and putting them into a different category, 2) questioning whether the first criterion puts too much emphasis on individual basins.

Schnabel clarified that not every project in a basin that has been planned for, like Whipple Creek, would meet the first criterion. There are many projects in Whipple Creek, but not all of them directly support the specific objectives identified in the stormwater basin plan. For example, a specific objective is to arrest headcuts and prevent erosion in headwater streams and upper watershed streams. A project that addresses that objective would meet the criterion and receive the points, while a project that arrests headcuts at the bottom of the watershed would not meet the criterion. Rowell said that what Schnabel said makes sense in context, but may appear to the public as a unilateral decision to favor projects in a particular watershed. Schnabel agreed, and said that many criteria may require clarification.

Howard described a theoretical example of how the two criteria might work. Ecology is developing a TMDL for the East Fork Lewis River and will likely have specific implementation suggestions for the county within a year. Additionally, the Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board ranks the East Fork Lewis River highly for salmon recovery projects. Implementation monies will start to become available when the Board of County Commissioners approves the Watershed Plan. Projects that address these issues would receive points under the second of the criteria currently under discussion, which seems reasonable. The first criterion may be over-broad; most projects that come forward eventually will meet the first criterion because in a few years, the county will have done stormwater basin planning for every basin in the county. When that happens, the first criterion will become meaningless.

Henderson suggested breaking out each type of regional or local objective, such as TMDL, ESA, LCFRB as individual criterion; a project that meets multiple regional or local objectives would garner more points. You could include, "meets an objective of local stormwater basin plan." Barnett suggested changing it to read "Supports *two* or more existing stormwater basin planning objectives for the watershed in which it is located."

Howard suggested forming a subcommittee to look at the issue of the first criterion. Barnett stated that the result of today's meeting would be the draft final criteria and that county staff would run a test list of projects through the criteria to observe the results. If a subcommittee is formed, its recommendations will be included as part of the draft final criteria and will be used to test run the criteria. Any changes made as a result will be noted and presented at the next meeting. Gladson clarified that some version of this criterion might be used in a dry run and asked for consent from the group. Schnabel indicated that clarifying editing of the wording of the criterion would be welcome.

Can be integrated with other improvement projects at the same site or within a stream reach to maximize stream benefits

Schnabel stated that this criterion rewards projects or groups of projects that work together to provide more benefit than the sum of its parts. However, many of the projects in the list already have that quality, so perhaps this criterion is redundant. Barnett recommended eliminating this criterion, noting that Public Works already routinely packages projects for economies of scale. Henderson agreed. The group agreed to eliminate the criterion.

Relative Point Values

Barnett reviewed the current relative point values of the sections, which are:

15 points for MITIGATION FOR STORMWATER IMPACTS FROM EXISTING DEVELOPMENT

30 points for PROVIDE MITIGATION FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT AND REDEVELOPMENT

50 points for PROMOTE INNOVATIVE FUNDING AND IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECTS

50 points for PROTECT AND IMPROVE NATURAL WATERSHED FUNCTIONS

145 points total

[Factual note: the total from the proposed new section, SUPPORTS WATERSHED-SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES AND/OR REGIONAL PLANNING GOALS” is not included above.]

Gladson asked the group to evaluate the relative totals. Barnett stated that the first section should have more points. Owen stated that he did not like the relative values.

Barnett suggested making the first one worth 50 and leaving the others alone. Owen approved, but asked for justification for the second being worth so much less. Barnett replied that the primary means of mitigating for new development is regulation, not public infrastructure. Rowell stated that most of the stormwater problems are occurring in areas with existing development, making those projects more important. Swanson noted that projects that provide infrastructure for new development will not be funded by the Clean Water Fee, therefore a high ranking for them would not prevent existing development mitigations from being built by the Clean Water Program.

Howard stated that it is a struggle for him to understand how the county could consider building projects for new development despite the backlog of needed retrofits for existing development. Barnett stated that including projects for new development will not affect the backlog in any way; funding is separate from the ranking process and will vary with the focus of the project. Howard asked for clarification on what projects are being evaluated. Barnett replied that any stormwater project can be evaluated using the criteria. Howard said, “any way we can get dollars.” Barnett said yes; we are hoping to be able to get revenue from grants, share costs with road projects, partner with other organizations, to do things that cannot be funded with Clean Water Fees. Gladson noted that this would be consistent with the Transportation Plan, which does not use 100% Road Funds to fund projects. Gladson stated that the group could make a note of Howard’s concern. Rowell stated that many of the projects identified in the Legacy Plan mentioned by Howard previously are primarily flood-related, not water-quality related. The SCIP process is about ranking projects for water quality, not for drainage and flood issues. Barnett stated that a project that addresses only flooding issues might not score well in the ranking system, and also could not be paid for with Clean Water Fees. Howard noted that it is hard to differentiate. Barnett said that the SCIP process is setting up a Capital delivery system. Howard noted that the group will have to be able to explain these distinctions very clearly to the public.

Owen suggested modifying the point totals to equal 100, rather than the current odd number. He stated that the two most important sections are: 1) mitigate stormwater impacts, like flooding issues and 2) protect and improve natural watershed functions. Those two should be weighted equally and the other two should be lesser.

Barnett stated that promoting innovative funding is pretty important as well. Owen said the first and the fourth are the most important. Ron Wilson agreed with Owen.

Barnett suggested 35, 15, 15, 35. Streeter suggested 30, 20, 20, 30. Henderson suggested de-emphasizing the second a little bit. Schnabel suggested 30, 15, 25, 30.

Gladson asked if 30, 15, 25, 30 is agreeable. None objected. County staff will run a test list of projects through with a total of 100 points. Barnett will bring the results to Meeting #3.

Interim Basin Prioritization Criteria/Methods

Barnett said that the SCIPIT would not influence the prioritization of basins for stormwater basin planning, however reviewing the criteria and methods for selecting basins might be helpful. The initial basin plan was done for Whipple Creek, and many projects were identified. The highest priority areas for future assessment are those with:

- Increasing urbanization
- Existing urban areas
- Streams having less degraded conditions
- Basins with significant amounts of public land
- Basins that include larger road construction projects

The Lower Salmon Creek Watershed and along the I-5 corridor will likely be assessed in the next couple of years. Swanson stated that Water Resources should have a final basin prioritization document by the last SCIPIT meeting.

Discussion of Catalogued Projects

Barnett reviewed slides and photos regarding the types of projects to be reviewed, such as retrofits, channel and bank restoration, wetland and floodplain conservation, regional stormwater facilities to control quality or quantity for either future or existing development.

Howard suggested using only photographs from projects inside Clark County to illustrate project types to the public.

Project Submittal Forms

Project submittal forms are now available online.

Wrap Up

Gladson asked Barnett what types of information county staff would give the BOCC during the June 7th work session and what types of feedback it would seek from the Board. Barnett replied that they would explain the SCIPIT process, and will ask the Board what level of involvement it seeks in the process. For instance, the BOCC approves the TIP plan. Rowell stated that the meeting is open, but there is no guarantee that the public will be asked to speak.

Owen asked if the list of proposed projects is available on the web site. Barnett replied no. Owen noted that members of the public may be interested in looking at the proposed projects, or might be concerned about submitting a duplicate project. Barnett stated that duplicate submissions will not be a problem.

Barnett stated that he would provide the draft ranking criteria to the group prior to the next meeting.

Action Items

1. Eliminate redundancies within categories of the criteria – staff
2. Revise point value for each criterion to fit within established relative rankings on a 100-point scale – staff
3. Provide draft final criteria to SCIPIT via email – Barnett
4. Get local project photos – Howard and staff

Next Meeting

SCIPIT Meeting #3

June 20, 2006

6:00 PM to 8:00 PM

BOCC Training Room

Sixth Floor, Clark County Public Services Building

Vancouver WA

Respectfully Submitted,
Trista Kobluskie